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Systems containing a significant number of Op Amps can take a lot of time of simulation when Op Amps are described at the transistor level. For instance a 5th order filter might involve 7 Op Amps and if each Op Amps contains say 12 to 15 transistors, the SPICE analysis of a circuit containing 60 to 75 Transistors can be too long and tricky in particular for time domain simulations. Therefore the use of a macromodel representing the Op Amp behavior reduces the simulation time and the complexity of the analysis.

The simplicity of the analysis of Op Amps containing macromodels is because macromodels can be implemented using SPICE primitive components. Some examples of macromodels are discussed next.
1. Low Pass First Order

\[ H_{LP1} = \frac{k}{1 + s/\omega_p} \]

Option 1

\[ V_{in} \rightarrow R \rightarrow V_o \]

\[ \omega_p = \frac{1}{RC} \]

\[ k = 1 \]

Option 2

\[ A \sim 10^9 \]

\[ k = R/R_1 \]

\[ \omega_p = \frac{1}{RC} \]
Option 3

\[ V_{in} \quad R_1 \quad g_m V_x \quad R \quad C \quad V_x \quad V_o \]

\[ k = g_m R \quad ; \quad \omega_p = \frac{1}{RC} \]

2. Higher Order Low Pass

\[ H_{LP_2} = \frac{K}{(1 + s/\omega_{p_1})(1 + s/\omega_{p_2})} \]

Note.- If you need to isolate the output use a final VCVS with a gain of one

Let us consider a second-order case:

\[ \omega_{p_1} = 1/R_1C_1 \]
\[ \omega_{p_2} = 1/R_2C_2 \]
\[ K = K \]
\[ H_{LP3} = \frac{K_o}{s^2 + \frac{\omega_o}{Q} s + \omega^2_o} \]

Resonator (one zero, two complex poles)

\[ H_R = \frac{k(1 + s/\omega_z)}{s^2 + \frac{\omega_o}{Q} s + \omega^2_o} \]

\[ K_o = 1/LC \quad ; \quad H_{LP3}(0) = 1 \]
\[ \omega^2_o = 1/LC \]
\[ \frac{\omega_o}{Q} = \frac{R}{L} \]

\[ k = 1/LC \]
\[ \omega_z = R/L \]
\[ \omega^2_o = 1/LC \]
\[ \frac{\omega_o}{Q} = 1/RC \]
Active RC Filter Design with Nonlinear Opamp Macromodel

- Design a two stage Miller CMOS Op Amp in 0.35 μm and propose a macromodel containing up to the seventh-harmonic component.
- Compare actual transistor model versus the proposed non-linear macromodel.
- Use both macromodel and transistor level to design a LP filter with $H(o) = 10\text{dB}$, $f_{3dB} = 5\text{ MHz}$.
- Result comparison.
1st order Active-RC LP filter
Filter transfer function with Ideal Opamp

\[ H_{LP,ideal}(s) = -\frac{R_2}{R_1} \frac{1}{(1+sR_2C)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ H(o) = 10\text{dB} \rightarrow \frac{R_2}{R_1} = 10\text{dB} = 3.16 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

\[ f_{3\text{dB}} = 5 \text{ MHz} \rightarrow \frac{1}{R_2C} = 6.28*5\text{M} = 31.4\text{Mrad} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Choose R1, R2 and C from equations (1) ~ (3). To minimize loading effect, R2 should be large enough. Here we choose R2 = 31.6k\(\Omega\), R1 = 10k\(\Omega\), and C = 1pF.
Filter transfer function with finite Opamp gain and GBW

- One pole approximation for Opamp Modeling: \( Av = \frac{GB}{s} \) (it holds when GBW >> \( f_{3dB} \) and \( Av(0) >> 1 \))

\[
H_{LP,nonideal}(s) = \frac{-R_2}{R_1(1 + \frac{s}{GB})(1 + sR_2C) + \frac{s}{GB}R_2}
\]

- A two stage Miller Op amp is designed. GBW is chosen ~20 times the \( f_{3dB} \) to minimize the finite GBW effect; GBW = 100MHz is also easy to achieve in 0.35\( \mu \)m CMOS technology.
Non-Linear Model for a source-degenerated OTA
Linear Transistor Model:

S connected to Bulk

High frequency Zero

Pole

Input capacitance

Linear relation

S connected to Bulk

Linear OTA model:

$I_{O^-}$

$V_{in+}$

$I_{O^+}$

$I_{Bias}$

$V_{in-}$
Non-Linear OTA model:

Let: \[ I_0 = I_1 - I_2, \ I_{DC} = I_1 + I_2 \]

\[ V_{GS1} - V_{GS2} = V_{in^+} - V_{in^-} = v_d \]

We can easily get:

\[ I_0 = v_d \sqrt{\beta I_{DC}} \left( 1 - \frac{\beta v_d^2}{4 I_{DC}} \right)^{1/2} \]

Which can be expanded to: \[ I_0 = \alpha_1 v_d + \alpha_3 v_d^3 + O(v_d^5) \]

To determine Odd Harmonic effects for an ideal OTA!!
How to Extract the Coefficients:

Generally if we have: \[ i_{out} = a_0 + a_1 v_d + a_2 v_d^2 + a_3 v_d^3 \]

We can extract the coefficients by differentiation, where:

At \( v_d = 0 \), \[ i_{out} = a_0 \quad \frac{d}{dv_d} i_{out} = a_1 \quad \frac{d^2}{dv_d^2} i_{out} = 2a_2 \quad \frac{d^3}{dv_d^3} i_{out} = 6a_3 \]

- By Sweeping the input voltage and integrating the output current, we can these coefficients.
- \( a_2 \) is ideally zero.
- Getting the first 3 coefficients only is a valid approximation.
A source degenerated OTA as an example:

Output current of one branch versus input differential voltage.
**Coefficients:**

\[ a_0 = 206.777 \mu A \]
\[ a_1 = 1.69094 \text{mA/v} \]
\[ a_2 = 9.07 \mu A/v^2 \]
\[ a_3 = -1.764 \text{mA/v}^3 \]

The accuracy of these numbers depends on the number of points used in the DC sweep.

By taking more points, even harmonics reduce to zero.
Macromodel used:

1. Non-linear transfer function.
2. non-dominant pole.
3. Feed-forward path leads to Right half plane zero. ($C_{gd}$ of the driver trans.)


DC sweep of Macromodel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transistor level</th>
<th>Macro-model</th>
<th>Percentage of error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_0$ ($\mu$A)</td>
<td>206.777</td>
<td>206.768</td>
<td>4.3 m%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$ (mA/V)</td>
<td>1.69094</td>
<td>1.69094</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$ ($\mu$A/V^2)</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.5988</td>
<td>5.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_3$ (mA/V^2)</td>
<td>-1.764</td>
<td>-1.7639</td>
<td>5.66 m%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes due to measurement accuracy and number of points
AC response comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transistor level</th>
<th>Macro-model</th>
<th>Percentage of error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC gain</td>
<td>32.8 dB</td>
<td>32.8 dB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_0$</td>
<td>359 226 MHz</td>
<td>347.69 MHz</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase margin</td>
<td>$90.62^0$</td>
<td>$89.7^0$</td>
<td>1.015 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two stage Miller Amplifier Design
# Opamp Design parameters

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td><strong>278uA @ 3V</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>PMOS(W/L)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30u/0.4u</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NMOS(W/L)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15u/0.4u</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>PMOS(W/L)</strong></td>
<td><strong>120u/0.4u</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NMOS(W/L)</strong></td>
<td><strong>60u/0.4u</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cm</strong></td>
<td><strong>800fF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>400 Ω</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPAMP Frequency response

- DC Gain: 53 dB, GBW: 86.6 MHz, phase margin: 69.7 deg.
- Dominant pole: 154KHz, Second pole: 197MHz
Output Spectrum of Open Loop OPAMP

1mVpp input @ 1KHz (THD= -49.2dB)
\[ V_{out} = a_0 + a_1 v_d + a_2 v_d^2 + a_3 v_d^3 + a_4 v_d^4 + a_5 v_d^5 + a_6 v_d^6 + a_7 v_d^7 \]

- \( a_1 \sim a_7 \) can be extracted from PSS simulation results:

\[ a_1 = \text{DC gain} = 450 \]

\[ HD_2 = \frac{a_2 A}{2a_1} = 41.92\,dB \quad \Rightarrow \quad a_2 = 2934 \]

\[ HD_3 = \frac{a_3 A^2}{4a_1} = 59.1\,dB \quad \Rightarrow \quad a_3 = 2.16e6 \]

Similarly, we can obtain: \( a_4 = 6e7, \ a_5 = 5.6e11, \ a_6 = 1e13, \ a_7 = 7e16 \)
Opamp Macro model

- Modeled: input capacitance, two poles, one RHP zero, nonlinearity, finite output resistance, and capacitance
- Nonlinearity model should be placed before the poles to avoid poles multiplication
Nonlinearity Model

- uses mixer blocks to generate nonlinear terms
- model up to 7\textsuperscript{th} order non-linearity
- set each VCCS Gain as the nonlinear coefficients.
- set the gain for 1\textsuperscript{st} VCCS = \( gm1 = 512\mu\text{A/V} \), gain for 2\textsuperscript{nd} VCCS = \( gm2 = 2.85\text{mA/V} \), and scale all the nonlinear coefficients derived above by \( a_1 \).
**Opamp AC response:**
Transistor-level vs. Macromodel

- Macro-model mimics the transistor level very well at frequencies below 10MHz.
- Discrepancy at higher frequency due to the higher order poles and zeros not modeled in the Macromodel.
Filter AC response: Transistor-level vs. Macromodel
Output Spectrum (0dBm input @ 1KHz)

- Macromodel (THD = -63dB)
- Transistor Level (THD = -66.4dB)
Performance Comparison

Table I. Open loop Opamp Performance Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transistor Level</th>
<th>Macro-model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3dB BW</td>
<td>154KHz</td>
<td>180KHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBW</td>
<td>86.6MHz</td>
<td>90MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Gain</td>
<td>53 dB</td>
<td>51.3 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Margin</td>
<td>69.7 degree</td>
<td>74.9 degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD: -50dBm @ 1KHz</td>
<td>-49.2 dB</td>
<td>-49.6 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. LPF Performance Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transistor Level</th>
<th>Macro-model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BW of LPF</td>
<td>4.9MHz</td>
<td>4.86MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Gain of LPF</td>
<td>9.95 dB</td>
<td>10.19 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD: 0dBm @ 1KHz</td>
<td>-66.4 dB</td>
<td>-63dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation

- THD of the LPF at 0dBm input is better than that of the open loop Opamp with a small input at -50dBm. This is because OPAMP gain is ~50 dB, when configured as a LPF, OPAMP input is attenuated by the feedback loop better linearity.

- when keep increasing the input amplitude, the THD of the transistor-level degrades dramatically. This is because large swing activates more nonlinearity and even cause transistors operating out of saturation region; however, the THD of Macro-model doesn’t reflect this because we didn’t implement the limiter block.
Gm-C Filter Design with Nonlinear Opamp Macromodel

- Use a three current mirror Transconductance Amplifier.
- Compare actual transistor model versus the non-linear macromodel
- Use both macromodel and transistor level to design a LP filter with $H(o) = 10\text{dB}$, $f_{3\text{dB}} = 5\text{ MHz}$
- Result Comparison
1\textsuperscript{st} order Gm-C LP filter
Filter transfer function

With Ideal OTA:

\[ H(s)_{ideal} = -\frac{g_{m1}}{g_{m2}} \frac{1}{1 + sC / g_{m2}} \]

\[ H(\omega) = 10\text{dB} \rightarrow \frac{g_{m1}}{g_{m2}} = 10\text{dB} = 3.16 \]

\[ f_{3\text{dB}} = 5\text{ MHz} \rightarrow \frac{g_{m2}}{C} = 6.28*5\text{M} = 31.4\text{Mrad} \]

Output resistance of gm1 should be $>> 1/gm2$

Choose C = 4pF, $\rightarrow gm2 = 0.126\text{mA/V}$, gm1 = 0.4mA/V
Three Current mirrors OTA Design
OTA Design parameters

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>240uA @ ± 1.5V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input NMOS</td>
<td>4u/0.6u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMOS current mirror</td>
<td>12u/0.4u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMOS current mirror</td>
<td>1u/0.4u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AC simulation of Gm: Transistor Level

\[ gm = 0.4 \text{mA/V}, \text{ which is our desired value} \]

its frequency response is good enough for a LPF with 5MHz cutoff frequency
OTA Output resistance: Transistor Level

output resistance of the OTA >> 1/gm2
Gm-C LPF Output spectrum: Transistor level

- THD = -26dB for 0dBm input@1kHz
OTA Macro model

- Since the internal poles and zeros are at much higher frequency than 5MHz, only the important ones are included in the macro-model
- Nonlinearity model is the same as the Opamp in Active-RC filter
AC simulation of Gm: Macro-model
OTA Output resistance: Macro-model

output resistance of the OTA $\gg 1/gm2$
Gm-C LPF Frequency response
Gm-C LPF Output spectrum: Macromodel

- THD = -33dB for 0dBm input@1kHz
Performance Comparison

Table I. Gm-C Filter Performance Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transistor Level</th>
<th>Macro-model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>409uA/V</td>
<td>412uA/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW of LPF</td>
<td>5.05MHz</td>
<td>5.05MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Gain of LPF</td>
<td>10 dB</td>
<td>10 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD: 0dBm @ 1KHz</td>
<td>-26 dB</td>
<td>-33dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Comparison between Transistor Level Active-RC and Gm-C LPF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active RC</th>
<th>Gm-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC gain</td>
<td>9.95dB</td>
<td>10dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>4.9MHz</td>
<td>5.05MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD: 0dBm @ 1KHz</td>
<td>-66.4 dB</td>
<td>-26 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Level</td>
<td>0.048µV/ @1kHz</td>
<td>0.05µV/ @1kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.83mW</td>
<td>0.72mW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

With comparable DC gain, BW, Noise level and Power consumption, Gm-C filter has much worse linearity than Active RC because:

- Active RC: feedback configuration improves linearity;
- Gm-C filter: open loop operation, the gm stage sees large signal swing, thus linearization technique is needed, which adds power consumption.

Active RC is preferable for low frequency applications if linearity is a key issue.